

JUL 13 2010

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff/Respondent,	§	
	§	CR. No. C-09-833
v.	§	C.A. No. C-10-134
	§	
PEDRO FLORES-QUIRINO,	§	
	§	
Defendant/Movant.	§	

ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR EXTENSION

Pending before the Court is the government's opposed motion for a forty-five day extension of time to file its response to Pedro Flores-Quirino's 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion, which was received by the Clerk on July 12, 2010. (D.E. 29.) The motion states that the Court originally ordered a response to the § 2255 motion to be filed within forty-five days. (D.E. 29 at 1.) In fact, however, the Court ordered the United States to respond not later than sixty days after entry of its June 10, 2010 Order. (Compare, D.E. 29 with D.E. 27.)¹

In any event, the government states that it seeks a forty-five day extension of time, and requests a new deadline of September 24, 2010, which is in fact forty-five days after the current due date. The Court finds that the Government has shown good cause for its request and its motion (D.E. 29) is therefore GRANTED. The response shall be filed not later than

¹ The Court further suggests that the United States use more care in preparing its proposed orders. The order submitted in this case included United States District Judge Jack's name in the signature line, rather than the undersigned (who is, of course, the assigned judge) and further referred to Judge Jack as a Magistrate Judge.

September 24, 2010.

Pursuant to Rule 5(d) of the RULES GOVERNING SECTION 2255 PROCEEDINGS FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS (2009), Flores-Quirino may file a reply not later than thirty days after service of the government's answer.

ORDERED this 23 day of July, 2010.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Hayden Head", written over a horizontal line.

HAYDEN HEAD
SENIOR U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE